

Date: September 13, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting

Item No. **5.**

## MILPITAS PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA REPORT

---

Category: Presentation & Action

Report Prepared by: Diana Whitecar

Public Hearing: Yes: ☐ No: ☒

Notices Mailed On: August 14, 2006 (NOP Notices to Taxing Agencies)

Posted On: N/A

---

**TITLE:** SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SEIR) FOR THE PROPOSED MERGER OF MILPITAS REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA NO. 1 AND THE GREAT MALL REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

**Proposal:** That the Planning Commission hold the Scoping meeting and receive public comments.

**Location:** See Attached Map

**APN:** N/A

**RECOMMENDATION:** Receive public testimony on the scope and content of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the proposed redevelopment project area merger, including what environmental issues and concerns that should be considered in preparing the SEIR. No decision is needed on the actual SEIR or proposed redevelopment project area merger at this time.

**Applicant:** The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas

**Property Owner:** N/A

**Previous Action(s):** N/A

**General Plan Designation:** N/A

**Present Zoning:** N/A

**Existing Land Use:** N/A

**Agenda Sent To:** Economic Development Commission

**Attachments:** Initial Study and Environmental Checklist and Notice of Preparation

### BACKGROUND

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas ("Redevelopment Agency") is proposing to adopt amendments to the existing Redevelopment Plans for its Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 and Great Mall Redevelopment Project Area ("Project Areas") to merge these two Project Areas into one "Merged Project Area." The proposed merger of these two existing redevelopment project areas is

intended to provide the Redevelopment Agency with the authority and fiscal ability to further its economic development and housing opportunity improvement objectives in and near the merged project areas. The merger is expected to help accomplish these objectives by, among other activities, enabling the installation of up to three new advertising signs and renovation or replacement of up to two existing advertising signs at locations along the I-880 and I-680 highway corridors through the City. The signs are intended to facilitate the increased economic viability of the Great Mall Shopping Center and other businesses located within the Merged Project Area. The signs are also intended to provide opportunities for public and civic announcements.

## **PROJECT BACKGROUND:**

The Redevelopment Plan for Project Area No. 1 was originally adopted in 1976 and has been amended several times since then, most recently in 2003. The Redevelopment Plan for the Great Mall Project Area was originally adopted in 1993 and has been amended twice since then, most recently in 2001. The proposed merger is intended to continue and improve Redevelopment Agency abilities to implement economic development and housing opportunity improvement objectives established in these two previously adopted Redevelopment Plans. The growth-inducing (urban intensification) effects of the original Redevelopment Plans for Project Area No. 1 and the Great Mall Project Area, and subsequent amendments, have been and will continue to be dictated by the City of Milpitas General Plan and associated zoning controls. The overall growth-inducing effects and associated environmental impacts of these two original Redevelopment Plans and subsequent amendments have been adequately addressed in the following two previous Redevelopment Agency-certified Environmental Impact Reports.

- Final EIR for the Adoption of the Redevelopment Plan for the Great Mall Project, State Clearinghouse No. 92063043, 1993; and
- Final EIR for the Plan Amendment to Redevelopment Project Area No. 1, State Clearinghouse No. 9509357, 1996.

## **REQUIRED SEIR SCOPE:**

Pursuant to section 15163 (Supplement to an EIR), the SEIR for the proposed merger should include only the information necessary to make the previous CEQA documentation adequate for the two Redevelopment Projects as amended. The overall growth-inducing effects of the proposed merger and merger-enabled sign improvements will, by law, continue to be dictated by the same General Plan and zoning controls, and will therefore fall within the growth scenarios addressed in the previous CEQA documents listed above. The scope of the SEIR should be limited to evaluation of the added impacts of new actions facilitated by the merger, especially the potential impacts of the merger-enabled highway sign construction and renovation.

The Redevelopment Agency has prepared the attached Initial Study in CEQA-recommended format to further establish the focus of the SEIR on potentially new significant environmental effects or substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Environmental topics identified in the checklist as potentially significant include: aesthetics, land use/planning, noise, and transportation/ traffic.

The Planning Commission and members of the public may wish to suggest specific concerns within these environmental categories or additional environmental issues or concerns to give direction to the SEIR consultants.

In addition to any public comments received at tonight's public meeting, staff has also sent out a "Notice of Preparation" to interested agencies and parties so they may also have the opportunity to comment as to what should be in the SEIR. A copy of the Notice of Preparation is attached.

The public scoping session is an important part of the environmental review process. It allows the public and interested agencies an opportunity to comment early on in the process regarding what should be included in the SEIR. The Planning Commission should take public testimony and direct the comments to the SEIR consultants so as to assure that the appropriate issues are addressed.

#### **SEIR SCHEDULE:**

Redevelopment Agency Staff anticipates that the Draft SEIR should be completed by mid-September 2006 and that the Draft Report on the Merger Amendments will be completed in early October. Following completion, both documents will be available for public review and comment. The City Council will then review both documents and is anticipated to adopt them by the end of the 2006.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Planning Commission take public testimony on the scope and content of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the proposed redevelopment project area merger, including what environmental issues and concerns should be considered in preparing the SEIR. No decision is needed on the actual SEIR or proposed redevelopment project area merger at this time.



5

FILE COPY

## NOTICE OF PREPARATION

**To:** Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, Affected Taxing Agencies, and Other Interested Parties

**Subject:** Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report<sup>1</sup>

**From:** The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas

**Street Address:** 455 E. Calaveras Boulevard

**City/State/Zip:** Milpitas, California 95035-5411

**Contact:** Diana Whitecar, Economic Development Manager

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas (Redevelopment Agency) will be the Lead Agency and will prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the proposed project identified below. We are interested in the views of your agency as to the appropriate scope and content of the SEIR's environmental information pertaining to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project.

The proposed project, its location, and its potential environmental effects are described in the attached Initial Study.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but **not later than 30 days** after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas, Attention: Diana Whitecar, Economic Development Manager; 455 E. Calaveras Boulevard, Milpitas, California 95035-5411. Please provide a contact name for your agency with your comments.

**Project Title:** Proposed Merger of the Milpitas Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 and the Great Mall Redevelopment Project

**Project Applicant:** The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas

**Project Location:** The project location is described in the attached Initial Study.

**Project Description:** The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas ("Redevelopment Agency") is proposing to adopt merger amendments to the existing Redevelopment Plans for the Milpitas Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 and Great Mall Redevelopment Project Area ("Project Areas") in order to continue and improve implementation of the Redevelopment Agency's economic development and housing opportunity improvement objectives in or near the two Project Areas ("Merged Project Area"). The proposed merger amendments ("merger") are expected to help accomplish these objectives by, among other activities, enabling the installation of up to three new advertising signs and the renovation or replacement of up to two existing advertising signs at locations along the I-880 and I-680 highway corridors through the City. Up to two of the signs are expected to include digital message boards. The remaining signs are expected to be fixed, monument type signs with no digital message boards. The signs are intended to facilitate the increased economic viability of the Great Mall Shopping Center and other businesses located within the

<sup>1</sup>References: California Code of Regulations, Title 14, (CEQA Guidelines) Sections 15082(a), 15103, 15163, and 15375.

Merged Project Area. The signs are also intended to provide opportunities for public and civic announcements.

**DSEIR Scope:**

The Redevelopment Plan for Project Area No. 1 was originally adopted in 1976 and has been amended several times since then, most recently in 2003. The Redevelopment Plan for the Great Mall Project Area was originally adopted in 1993 and has been amended twice since then, most recently in 2001. The proposed merger is intended to continue and improve Redevelopment Agency abilities to implement economic development and housing opportunity improvement objectives established in these two previously-adopted Redevelopment Plans. The growth-inducing (urban intensification) effects of the two original Redevelopment Plans for Project Area No. 1 and the Great Mall Project Area, and subsequent amendments, have been and will continue to be dictated by the City of Milpitas General Plan and associated zoning controls. The overall, growth-inducing effects and associated environmental impacts of these two original Redevelopment Plans and subsequent amendments have been adequately addressed in the following two previous Redevelopment Agency-certified Environmental Impact Reports.

- Final EIR for the Adoption of the Redevelopment Plan for the Great Mall Project, State Clearinghouse No. 92063043, 1993; and
- Final EIR for the Plan Amendment to Redevelopment Project Area No. 1, State Clearinghouse No. 9509357, 1996.

Pursuant to section 15163 (Supplement to an EIR), the SEIR for the currently-proposed merger amendments will include only the information necessary to make the previous CEQA documentation adequate for the two Redevelopment Projects as amended. The overall growth-inducing effects of the currently-proposed merger amendments and merger-enabled sign improvements will, by law, continue to be dictated by the same General Plan and zoning controls, and will therefore fall within the growth scenarios addressed in the previous CEQA documents listed above. The scope of the SEIR will be limited to evaluation of the added impacts of new actions facilitated by the merger, especially the potential impacts of the merger-enabled highway sign construction and renovation.

The Redevelopment Agency has prepared the attached Initial Study in CEQA-recommended format to further establish the focus of the SEIR on potentially new significant environmental effects or substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**Notice of Scoping Meeting:**

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15082(c) (Notice of Preparation and Determination of Scope of EIR), the Redevelopment Agency will conduct a Scoping Meeting for the purpose of soliciting views of adjacent jurisdictions, responsible agencies, agencies with jurisdiction by law, trustee agencies, and interested parties requesting notice, as to the appropriate scope and content of the SEIR. The Scoping Meeting will be held before the City of Milpitas Planning Commission on September 13, 2006 at 7:00 PM in the City of Milpitas Council Chambers, 455 E. Calaveras Boulevard, Milpitas, California.

Diana Whitecar, Economic Development Manager  
Telephone: (408) 586-3059  
FAX: (408) 586-3056

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Distribution List:

Milpitas City Council  
Milpitas Planning Commission  
Milpitas Finance Department  
Milpitas Community Development Department  
Milpitas Public Works Department  
Milpitas Neighborhood Services Department  
Milpitas Traffic Engineer  
Milpitas City Engineer  
Milpitas Police Department  
Milpitas Fire Department  
Milpitas Leisure Services Division  
Milpitas Unified School District  
Milpitas Chamber of Commerce  
Santa Clara County Planning Department  
Santa Clara County Department of Environmental Health  
Santa Clara County Department of Roads and Airports  
Santa Clara County Congestion Management Agency  
Santa Clara County Transportation Agency  
Santa Clara Valley Water District

City of San Jose Planning Department  
City of San Jose Redevelopment Agency  
City of San Jose Airport Department  
City of Fremont Planning Division  
Alameda County Planning Department  
San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board  
San Francisco Bay Regional Air Quality Management  
District  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
California Air Resources Board  
California Department of Housing & Community  
Development  
California Department of Transportation  
California Office of Historic Preservation  
Federal Aviation Administration District Office  
California Department of Fish and Game  
Lick Observatory  
All affected taxing agencies

This Notice of Preparation, attached Initial Study, referenced previous EIRs, and supporting materials are available for review at the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas, 455 E. Calaveras Boulevard, and at the Milpitas Community Library, 40 North Milpitas Boulevard, Milpitas.



## INITIAL STUDY FOR THE PROPOSED MERGER OF MILPITAS REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA NO. 1 AND THE GREAT MALL REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA

---

1. **Project Title:** Proposed Merger of the Milpitas Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 and the Great Mall Redevelopment Project
2. **Lead Agencies:** Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas  
455 E. Calaveras Boulevard  
Milpitas, California 95035-5411
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Diana Whitecar, Economic Development Manager  
Telephone: (408) 586-3059  
FAX: (408) 586-3056

#### 4. **Project Overview:**

Pursuant to California Community Redevelopment Law ("CRL"), the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas ("Redevelopment Agency") is proposing to adopt amendments to the existing Redevelopment Plans for its Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 and Great Mall Redevelopment Project Area ("Project Areas") to merge these two Project Areas into one "Merged Project Area." The proposed merger amendments ("merger") are intended to provide the Redevelopment Agency with the authority and fiscal ability to further its economic development and housing opportunity improvement objectives in and near the Merged Project Area. The merger is expected to help accomplish these objectives by, among other activities, enabling the installation of up to three new advertising signs and renovation or replacement of up to two existing advertising signs at locations along the I-880 and I-680 highway corridors through the City. The signs are intended to facilitate the increased economic viability of the Great Mall Shopping Center and other businesses located within the Merged Project Area. The signs are also intended to provide opportunities for public and civic announcements.

#### 5. **Project Background:**

The Redevelopment Agency is responsible for implementing redevelopment activities within the City of Milpitas, pursuant to California Community Redevelopment Law. Milpitas has established two redevelopment Project Areas: Milpitas Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 ("Project Area No. 1") and the Great Mall Redevelopment Project Area. Project Area No. 1 currently contains approximately 2,230 acres or 94 percent of the proposed Merged Project Area. The Great Mall Redevelopment Project Area currently contains approximately 150 acres or 6 percent of the Merged Project Area.

The original Redevelopment Plan for Project No. 1 was adopted by the City Council in 1976. The original Redevelopment Plan for the Great Mall Project Area was adopted by the City Council in 1993. Both redevelopment projects have been amended since then.

6. **Terminology:** As used in this Initial Study, the CEQA term "project" is defined to mean the proposed merger amendments to the existing Redevelopment Plans for Project Area No. 1 and the Great Mall Project Area, as well as all proposed merger-enabled actions to facilitate continued economic development and housing improvement in and near the Merged Project Area, including the installation of up to three new advertising signs and renovation or replacement of up to two existing advertising signs along the I-880 and I-680 freeway corridors through Milpitas.

7. **Project Area Location:** Figure 1 shows the boundaries of the two Project Areas to be merged, which encompass the City's major commercial areas. Project Area No. 1 consists of approximately 2,230

acres located in the central portion of the City, including the original downtown area and the City's primary industrial area. The Great Mall Project Area consists of approximately 150 acres encompassing the Great Mall of the Bay Area shopping center complex, bounded by Great Mall Parkway, Montague Expressway, South Main Street, and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks.

**8. Project Sponsors' Names and Addresses:** The project sponsor is the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas, 455 E. Calaveras Boulevard, Milpitas, California 95035-5411; contact: Diana Whitecar, Economic Development Manager.

**9. General Plan Designations:** The proposed Merged Project Area includes a variety of City of Milpitas General Plan commercial, industrial, residential and other land use designations. These designations will be described in more detail in the SEIR. No change in General Plan designations or policies is proposed.

**10. Zoning:** Similarly, the proposed Merged Project Area includes a variety of associated commercial, industrial, residential and other land use districts consistent with the General Plan. These districts will be described in more detail in the SEIR. No change in zoning is proposed.

**11. Description of Project:** The proposed Project Area merger is intended to provide the Redevelopment Agency with the authority and fiscal ability to further its economic development and housing opportunity improvement objectives in and near the Merged Project Area. The merger would enable, among other redevelopment activities, the construction of up to three new advertising signs and the renovation or replacement of up to two existing advertising signs along the I-880 and I-680 highway corridors through Milpitas in order to increase public awareness and the economic viability of Merged Project Area businesses. The proposed highway sign improvements are intended to prominently advertise private businesses and public/civic events within the Merged Project Area. Up to two of the signs are expected to include digital message boards. The remaining signs are expected to be fixed, monument type signs with no digital message boards. The signs would be designed to provide for increased advertising signage visibility, capacity, flexibility and marketing quality, and thereby increase awareness of Merged Project Area businesses and public/civic activities.

(a) Purposes of the Proposed Merger. Section 33485 *et seq.* of the CRL allows for merger of redevelopment project areas as a matter of public policy if the merger will result in substantial benefit to the public, and will contribute to the revitalization of the Project Areas through the increased economic vitality of such areas and through increased and improved housing opportunities in or near such areas. The CRL also provides that redevelopment project areas, under the jurisdiction of a redevelopment agency, may be merged without regard to contiguity of the areas, by the amendment of each affected redevelopment plan.

Furthermore, taxes attributable to each project area merged that are allocated to the redevelopment agency may be allocated to the entire merged project area for the purpose of paying the principal of, and interest on, indebtedness incurred by the redevelopment agency to finance or refinance, in whole or in part, the merged redevelopment project. (It should be noted that the Milpitas Redevelopment Agency does not receive any tax increment funds from the Great Mall Project Area and the proposed Merger and Amendments do not provide for the Agency to do so.)

The primary purpose of the proposed Milpitas merger is to facilitate and increase the economic viability of the Great Mall Shopping Center and other businesses in the Merged Project Area by, among other things, enabling installation of new advertising signs and renovation or replacement of existing advertising signs along the I-880 and I-680 freeway corridors through the City promoting Merged Project Area businesses.

In addition, the California Outdoor Advertising Act ("Act") applies to the placement of advertising displays within 660 feet from the edge of the right-of-way when the advertising copy is visible from interstate highways or primary highways (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §5271). Under the Act, signs advertising businesses and activities developed within the boundary limits of a redevelopment project area may, with the consent of the redevelopment agency, be located anywhere within the limits of the project area when all of the land in the project area: (1) is contiguous, (2) is separated only by a public highway, or (3) includes land on which public facilities are developed. Under the Act, the signs may be in place for a period not to exceed 10 years or the termination of the redevelopment project, whichever occurs first,



unless an arrangement has been made for extension of the period between the redevelopment agency and CalTrans for good cause (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code 5273).

By merging the two projects, all territory within the Project No. 1 Area and the Great Mall Project Area, with the exception of one 0.89-acre area within the Great Mall Project Area, would be contiguous and therefore qualify under part (1) of the Act. The one exception--i.e., the 0.89-acre area within the Great Mall Project Area which is non-contiguous--would nevertheless qualify under part (2) of the Act, because it would be separated from the rest of the proposed Merged Project Area by a public highway (Interstate 680). With the proposed merger, businesses throughout the Merged Project Area would be able to advertise on the new and renovated or replaced signs along the freeway corridors within the Merged Project Area. Without the proposed merger, such advertising would be limited or prohibited by the Act.

The additional awareness and increased patronage of Merged Project Area businesses is expected to increase the economic viability of businesses throughout the Merged Project Area. By increasing the viability of the core of the City, it is expected that the desirability of the area would be enhanced, further increasing the viability of additional housing development, including affordable housing. (As of fiscal year 2005-06, the Agency has exceeded its inclusionary requirement for providing affordable housing in or outside the two involved project areas by nearly 32 percent.)

Figure 1 shows the boundaries of the two Project Areas to be merged. The proposed Merged Project Area will contain approximately 2,380 acres, which would comprise approximately 27 percent of the total acres located within the Milpitas City limits. The general location of the proposed new and renovated or replaced signs is shown on Figures 2. The current Redevelopment Plans for the two Project Areas to be merged, and associated objectives of the proposed merger, are described below:

(b) Redevelopment Project Area No. 1. Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 ("Project No. 1") contains approximately 2,230 acres or 94 percent of the proposed Merged Project Area. The original Redevelopment Plan for Project No. 1 was adopted in September 1976. Since then, the Project No. 1 Redevelopment Plan has been amended nine times. The Redevelopment Plan for Project Area No. 1 was most recently amended in 2003 to increase the Project Area size, extend the plan time limits, and increase the Project Area debt limit. This allowed the Redevelopment Agency to issue a \$200 million tax allocation bond to finance its current redevelopment program for Project Area No. 1.

The adopted Project No. 1 Redevelopment Plan identifies various redevelopment goals and objectives for the Project Area No. 1, including:

- development of a safe, convenient and efficient transportation system serving the area, with special consideration for the circulation and parking needs of residential and business uses in the City's central business district;
- prevention of dispersal of employment opportunities and activities over a larger area and associated greater travel dependence and inconvenience;
- promotion of community utilities and public infrastructure development commensurate with City and regional needs;
- elimination of blighting influences including vacant and under-utilized land, deteriorated buildings, inadequate infrastructure, and other physical, economic, and environmental deficiencies;
- development of adequate civic, recreational, and cultural activity locations in the community;
- stimulation of commercial and industrial development and rehabilitation and creation of associated employment opportunities;
- rehabilitation and redevelopment of areas that are stagnant or improperly utilized;
- provision of opportunities for participation by owners in the revitalization of their properties;





- publicizing of the position and special advantages of Milpitas as a place to conduct compatible and viable industrial and commercial activity; and
- provision of a variety of residential types to serve varying local and regional housing needs.

The proposed merger is intended to enable construction of new advertising signs and renovation or replacement of existing advertising signs along I-880 and I-680 through Milpitas, thereby furthering the above goals for Project Area No. 1 by:

- providing improved highway advertisement opportunities for central business district businesses and other businesses and public/civic activities in Project Area No. 1; and thereby
- increasing the desirability of the Project Area No. 1 as a place to conduct business;
- increasing Project Area No. 1 development viability and attracting more business to Project Area No. 1;
- drawing attention to Project Area No. 1 business areas, and in particular, highway-dependent (region-serving) businesses in the area, that are not or are no longer prominently visible from highway corridors due to Milpitas development patterns;
- providing improved way-finding--i.e., improved direction and efficiency--for vehicular traffic traveling to Project Area No. 1 commercial locations;
- providing funding for sign construction/reconstruction and maintenance by private businesses, including collecting fees through the establishment of a signage improvement district for benefiting businesses; and
- attracting a greater variety of uses to Project Area No. 1, including the downtown core, thereby increasing Project Area No. 1 desirability as a housing location, including affordable housing.

(c) Great Mall Redevelopment Project. The Great Mall Redevelopment Project Area ("Great Mall Project Area") consists of 150 acres. The original Redevelopment Plan for the Great Mall Project Area was adopted in 1993. The Great Mall Redevelopment Plan has been amended twice since then. The Plan was most recently amended in 2001 to add two non-contiguous parcels that would allow the continued use of freestanding highway advertising signs for the Great Mall Shopping Center. Tax increment is not collected from the Great Mall Project Area and the proposed merger would not change this status.

The identified purpose of the Great Mall Redevelopment Project has been to further the ongoing development and viability of the approximately 1,200,000 square foot Great Mall Shopping Center. Initially, the Agency assisted in the construction of necessary public infrastructure improvements to support this retail land use. Although the Agency does not receive tax increment revenue from the Great Mall Project Area, the City receives sales tax revenues from Great Mall retail activities. Under an Owner Participation Agreement with Ford Land Development, the original developer of the Great Mall, the City continues to share one-half of the sales tax revenues generated by sales at the Great Mall to reimburse Ford for the \$8.5 million in mall-facilitating public improvements that also benefit the City. After Ford sold the Great Mall to the Swerdlow Group in May 2000, the City issued the Great Mall of the Bay Area Sales Tax Revenue Bonds at a more favorable interest rate to reimburse the developer.

The adopted Great Mall Redevelopment Plan identifies various goals and objectives for the Great Mall Project Area, including:

- elimination of blighting influences and correction of environmental deficiencies (e.g., obsolete and aged building types, building vacancies, uneconomic land uses, inadequate and deteriorated public improvements and utilities);
- rehabilitation and development of stagnant or improperly utilized areas;

- provision of opportunities for owner participation in revitalization of their properties;
- strengthening of retail and other commercial functions in the Great Mall Project Area;
- strengthening of the economic base of the Great Mall Project Area and community as a whole by installation of improvements to stimulate new commercial expansion, employment and economic growth;
- provision of adequate open space and parking; and
- establishment and implementation of performance criteria to assure high site design standards, environmental quality, and design unity and integrity in the Great Mall Project Area.

The proposed merger is intended to enable construction of new advertising signs and renovation or replacement of existing advertising signs along I-880 and I-680, thereby furthering the goals for the Great Mall Project Area by:

- strengthening existing commercial activity in and stimulating new commercial development in the Great Mall Project Area; and
- accommodating participation by the Great Mall owner and other businesses in the utilization and maintenance of the proposed new and renovated advertising signs.

(d) Proposed Sign Characteristics. It is proposed that at least two of the new and renovated or replaced signs would include electronic "reader board" components, while the remaining three would be fixed-copy monument signs. In addition, installation of up to 25 lower profile way-finding signs is anticipated within the public right-of-way (medians, etc.) of surface streets through the Merged Project Area, such as Montague Expressway and/or Calaveras Boulevard, directing traffic to businesses in the Merged Project Area (e.g., the Great Mall, auto-dealerships, etc.).

The proposed new and renovated or replaced signs are proposed to be similar in size and layout to numerous existing reader board and monument signs located along the Alameda and Santa Clara County stretches of I-880 and I-680 and along the San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara County stretches of U.S. 101.

The electronic reader board components would display rotating electronic (digital) "spots," typically approximately 8 seconds in duration, in 24-hour rotation, visible on two sides. At this preliminary point, top-of-sign maximum heights of up to 60 to 70 feet (four to five "stories") are anticipated for both the reader-board and monument type signs.

**12. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** Project Area No. 1 includes the City's core areas, including the recently reconstructed Milpitas Civic Center at Calaveras Boulevard and North Milpitas Boulevard and the City's central business district along Main Street. Portions of Project Area No. 1 also fall within the Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan planning area, for which a new specific plan and EIR are currently being prepared. Project Area No. 1 is surrounded by an extensive mix of single-family and multi-family residential, commercial, research and development, industrial, distribution, institutional and transportation uses.

Similarly, the Great Mall Project Area is in an urbanized area surrounded by an existing mix of general commercial, industrial and residential uses. Since the opening of the Great Mall in September 1994, areas surrounding the Great Mall Project Area have been experiencing a land use transition from commercial and manufacturing to multi-family residential and commercial lodging.

**13. Required Local Approval Procedures:** The proposed merger amendments would require joint approval by the City of Milpitas City Council and the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas. Section 33354.6(a) of the CRL requires that when an agency proposes to amend a redevelopment project that utilizes tax increment to: (a) add territory to a project area; (b) increase either the limitation on the number of dollars (tax increment limit) to be allocated to the redevelopment agency or the time limit on

establishing loans, advances, and indebtedness (debt establishment); (c) lengthen the period during which the Plan is effective (plan effectiveness); (d) **merge projects**; or (e) add significant additional capital improvement projects; the agency shall follow the same procedures it would for the adoption of a redevelopment plan.

**14. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** Review by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is expected to be required for the proposed highway signs. No other public agency approvals are expected.

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics  | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality       | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils          | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing            |  |

## DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- ☒ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact." An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, **nothing further** is required.

Prepared by:

Signature:

  
John Wagstaff, Principal  
Wagstaff and Associates

Date:

8-14-06

Reviewed by:

Signature:

  
Diana Whitecar  
Economic Development Manager  
Redevelopment Agency of the City of Milpitas

Date:

August 14, 2006

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

### I. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

Explanation: The proposed merger is intended to enable, among other redevelopment activities, the construction of new advertising signs and the renovation or replacement of existing advertising signs along Milpitas segments of the I-880 and I-680 highway corridors. The proposed advertising sign locations are illustrated on Figure 2, herein. The proposed new and renovated or replaced signs are intended to improve advertisement of businesses and public activities within the Merged Project Area.

Up to three possible new advertising sign locations are proposed, including:

- the southwest quadrant of the I-880/SR 237 (Calaveras Blvd.-Alviso-Mipitas Rd.) interchange;
- the northwest quadrant of the I-680/Jacklin Road interchange; and
- the northwest quadrant of the I-670/SR 237 (Calaveras Boulevard) interchange.

These new signs would be located on private property within the Merged Project Area near the edge of the freeway right-of-way.

The two existing advertising signs proposed for Redevelopment Agency-assisted renovation or replacement are located at:

- the northwest quadrant of the I-880/Montague Expressway interchange; and
- the east edge of I-680 opposite Wrigley Way, between the I-680/SR 237 (Calaveras Boulevard) and I-680/Montague Expressway interchanges.

The three new and two renovated existing highway signs, particularly the up to two proposed electronic message board types, may be visible from and have significant adverse visual impacts on one or more scenic vistas (see item I.a, above), substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the proposed sign site or its surroundings (see item I.c, below), or create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views or nighttime sky viewing, in the area (see item I.d, below). The three new and two renovated or replaced advertising signs would, by design, be prominently visible from the I-880 and I-680 freeway corridors through Milpitas. The Santa Clara County segments of I-880 and I-680 are not designated State Scenic Highways; however, both are designated by the City of Milpitas General Plan as important "scenic connectors." The three new and two renovated or replaced advertising signs would also be visible to varying degrees from surrounding community vantage points, including locations in residential neighborhoods near or above the signs, with potentials to have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, substantially degrade the visual character or quality of affected neighborhood vantage points, or create new sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views (including nighttime sky views) in the affected neighborhoods. The proposed new sign locations along I-680 at Jacklin Road and at SR 237 (Calaveras Boulevard) are adjacent to existing single-family residential subdivisions, and may also be visible from more distant views from elevated roadways and residential neighborhoods east of I-680 (e.g.: Old Calaveras Road and hillside residential areas along Quince Drive, Country Club Drive and Calaveras Ridge Drive). The SEIR will address these issues.

- b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Explanation: There are no state-designated scenic highways near the proposed sign locations (the I-880, I-680, and SR 237 corridors through Milpitas are not designated State Scenic Highways).



- |   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less-Than-<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less-Than-<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact             |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Explanation: See item I.a above. The SEIR will address this issue.

- |   |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: See item I.a above. The SEIR will address this issue.

II. **AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.** (In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.) Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: No existing agricultural uses are located in or near the Merged Project Area. The City of Milpitas is not included on the maps of important farmland prepared biannually by the California Department of Conservation (a department of the California Resources Agency). The proposed merger would not result in conversion of any existing farmland or have an impact on existing agricultural resources.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: No portion of the Merged Project Area is zoned for agricultural use, nor is any portion of the area under a Williamson Act contract.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item II.a above.

III. **AIR QUALITY.** (Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.) Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: The proposed merger, including the merger-enabled new and reconstructed existing advertising signs, are intended to foster continued and increased business and other activity in the Merged Project Area. Any related ("project-induced") growth would by requirement be consistent with the applicable land use plans and zoning of the City of Milpitas. No General Plan or zoning changes are proposed by the project. The project and any associated project-induced growth would therefore not have any significant additional air emissions impacts beyond those previously analyzed and identified (see the list on page 2 of the attached Notice of Preparation of previous CEQA documentation for the two Redevelopment Plans being amended) or beyond those anticipated in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Clean Air Plan.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: See item III.a above.

- |   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less-Than-<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less-Than-<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact             |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/>             | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Explanation: See item III.a above.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: See item III.a above.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: See item III.a above.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: The Merged Project Area is comprised of and adjoins a developed urban environment. The proposed merger project and associated advertising sign construction and reconstruction activity would not result in a substantial additional effect on, or a substantial additional diminishment of, any plant or animal habitat or fish or other wildlife species beyond those previously addressed (see the list on page 2 of the attached Notice of Preparation of previous CEQA documentation for the two Redevelopment Plans being amended).

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: See item IV.a above.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: See item IV.a above.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The Merged Project Area is comprised of and adjoins a developed urban environment. The proposed new and reconstructed advertising signs would not interfere with the movement or activities of any

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or nursery sites.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved, local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The Merged Project Area is located in an urbanized environment and the proposed advertising sign locations are not subject to any adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

#### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: No known historic resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5 are located at or near the proposed new or renovated advertising sign sites.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The proposed new and renovated advertising sign sites are within urbanized areas. No additional substantial adverse changes in the significance of an archaeological resource in the Merged Project Area are anticipated beyond those previously addressed (see the list on page 2 of the attached Notice of Preparation of previous CEQA documentation for the two Redevelopment Plans being amended).

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: The Merged Project Area, including the proposed new and renovated advertising sign locations, encompasses an urbanized environment that does not include any identified unique geological features. No paleontological resources have been identified or indicated in these locations.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item V.b above. There are no formal cemeteries located near the proposed new and renovated sign locations or elsewhere within the Merged Project Area.

#### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

*Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication  
42.)*

Explanation: There are no known active faults traversing the Merged Project Area, and therefore no impacts from fault rupture are expected. By law, all merger-facilitated construction, including advertising sign construction and renovation, would be required to comply with current applicable building codes and engineering standards of the City of Milpitas. Nevertheless, the City, in its review of the proposed signage designs, may require preparation of individual geotechnical reports to assess the nature and severity of on-site geotechnical hazards (if any) and recommend appropriate engineering and construction features to reduce such hazards to less-than-significant levels.

- ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?* ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Explanation: The project area is within a seismically active region and could experience strong seismic ground shaking and related effects in the event of an earthquake on one of the identified active or potentially active faults in the region (e.g., San Andreas fault, Hayward fault, Calaveras fault). By law, all merger-facilitated construction, including advertising sign construction and re-construction, would be required to comply with the most stringent applicable seismic design provisions of the latest Uniform Building Code (UBC) as well as with the seismic safety performance standards of the City of Milpitas. Nevertheless, the City, in its review of the proposed sign designs, may require preparation of individual geotechnical reports to assess the nature and severity of on-site geotechnical hazards (if any) and recommend appropriate engineering and construction features to reduce such hazards to less-than-significant levels.

- iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?* ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Explanation: The liquefaction and other geotechnical impacts associated with redevelopment-facilitated urban growth and development in the Merged Project Area, and associated mitigation requirements, have been adequately addressed in previous CEQA documentation for the two Redevelopment Plans to be amended (see the list on page 2 of the attached Notice of Preparation). These previous geotechnical findings indicate that the potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, in the Merged Project Area, including the proposed advertising sign locations, is low. By law, all merger-facilitated construction, including advertising sign construction, would be required to comply with current applicable building codes and engineering standards of the City of Milpitas. Nevertheless, the City, in its review of the proposed signage designs, may require preparation of individual geotechnical reports to assess the nature and severity of on-site geotechnical hazards (if any) and recommend appropriate engineering and construction features to reduce such hazards to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, liquefaction-related damage to merger-enabled new and reconstructed signs is not anticipated.

- iv) *Landslides?* ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Explanation: The Merged Project Area, including the proposed sign construction and re-construction sites, is relatively flat and largely built out. The proposed new and re-constructed sign sites present minimal landslide hazard, with minimal natural topographic features. By law, all merger-facilitated construction, including advertising sign construction, would be required to comply with current applicable building codes and engineering standards of the City of Milpitas. Nevertheless, the City, in its review of the proposed signage designs, may require preparation of individual geotechnical reports to assess the nature and severity of on-site geotechnical hazards (if any) and recommend appropriate engineering and construction features to reduce such hazards to less-than-significant levels.

- b) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?* ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Explanation: Sign construction and re-construction facilitated by the proposed merger could involve grading or other activities that could temporarily expose disturbed soils to erosion. City requirements to reduce erosion would be implemented pursuant to the Milpitas Municipal Code.

- c) *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or* ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Explanation: See items VI.a.i through VI.a.iv above.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: As discussed under item VI.a above, merger-facilitated sign and other construction activity would be subject to review and approval by the City, an existing process designed to ensure that such redevelopment-facilitated construction projects would not create a substantial risk to life or property as a result of geotechnical factors, including expansive soils.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: No septic systems or other alternative wastewater disposal systems would be required due to the project.

## VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The project would not involve the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials to a degree that would create a significant hazard to the public.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item VII.a above.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item VII.a above.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The merger-enabled advertising sign construction and reconstruction sites are not included on such a list of hazardous materials sites.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

Explanation: The Merged Project Area, including the proposed advertising sign construction and reconstruction sites, is not located within any airport-related "restricted zone" (e.g., noise exposure/land use compatibility, height limit, airport obstruction) or within two miles of a public airport.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: No private airstrip exists in the Merged Project Area or surrounding vicinity.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: Merger-facilitated redevelopment activities would not be expected to physically interfere with any existing emergency response plans.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The Merged Project Area, including the proposed advertising sign locations, is within an urbanized setting with almost no wildland fire hazard potential.

#### VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the project:*

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: The merger-facilitated additional redevelopment activities, including the proposed new advertising sign construction and existing advertising sign reconstruction, would not result in any significant additional potentials for violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements beyond those addressed in the previous CEQA documentation for the two affected Redevelopment Plans (see list of previous CEQA documents on p. 2 of the attached Notice of Preparation). The proposed sign installation and sign renovation locations are already highly urbanized. The total grading area and amount of excavation necessary to install the new signs would be less than one acre in size and therefore below levels triggering National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements administered by the City and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), including associated Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) requirements.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: The proposed sign locations are small in area, surrounded by existing urbanization, and do not provide a significant source of groundwater or groundwater recharge. The proposed signs would have no measurable water supply implications.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

Explanation: The proposed new sign locations are small in area and surrounded by existing urbanization. The proposed new sign installation and existing sign renovation or replacement activities would not substantially change drainage rates, volumes, or patterns in the sign vicinities in a manner which would result in substantial erosion of siltation on- or off-site.

- d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Explanation: The merger-enabled sign construction activity would not significantly alter existing drainage patterns in the sign vicinities, would not alter the course of any existing drainage channel, and would not measurably increase the amount of surface runoff.

- e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Explanation: See items VIII.c and VIII.d above. The merger-enabled sign construction activity would not significantly alter existing drainage patterns in the sign vicinities, would not alter the course of any existing drainage channel, and would not measurably increase the amount of surface runoff.

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Explanation: See item VIII.a above.

- g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Explanation: The proposed merger and associated sign construction and reconstruction activities would not result in any substantial change in local housing development patterns from those anticipated in previous CEQA documentation prepared for the two affected Redevelopment Plans (see list on page 2 of the attached Notice of Preparation).

- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Explanation: The small area of ground disturbance associated with merger-related sign construction and reconstruction activities, and the added new permanent sign structures, would not have a significant effect on flood flows or the capacity of any flood inundation areas.

- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Explanation: See item VIII.g above.

- j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Explanation: The proposed new sign or affected existing locations are not susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

Explanation: The proposed merger-enabled new sign installation and renovation activities would not be in a location or be of a scale and configuration that would result in a significant impact on established community land use patterns.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance), adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: By law, redevelopment plan-facilitated development activities, including merger-enabled sign construction and reconstruction, would be subject to applicable goals, policies, guidelines, and standards of the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. As indicated under item I.a above, the proposed new and renovated sign sites, design characteristics, and simulated visual implications will be independently evaluated by the EIR consultants for consistency with pertinent Milpitas General Plan policies and standards, and with pertinent and applicable Caltrans policies and requirements.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The proposed Merged Project Area is not subject to an existing habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES.** *Would the project:*

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: No known mineral resources exist at the proposed new and renovated sign locations.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item X.a above.

**XI. NOISE.** *Would the project result in:*

- |  |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standard of other agencies? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: Anticipated merger-enabled sign construction and reconstruction activities, including earthmoving, could result in significant temporary increases in existing noise levels and temporary groundborne vibration impacts of one or more specific residential and commercial lodging properties nearest the proposed sign locations. The SEIR will address this issue.

- |   |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: See item XI.a above.

- |  |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

Explanation: The up to two advertising signs that are proposed to incorporate rotating digital (electronic) message boards may have significant long-term noise intrusion impacts on noise-sensitive nearby land uses. This issue will be addressed in the SEIR.

- |  |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: See item XI.a above.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The proposed merger-enabled sign construction and reconstruction locations are not within an existing airport land use plan referral area and are not within two miles of a public or public use airport.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: No private airstrip is located in the proposed sign construction or reconstruction area vicinities.

## XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: The proposed redevelopment plan merger amendments and merger-enabled sign construction and reconstruction would not be expected to induce substantial additional urban growth in the Merged Project Area, and associated cumulative, "programmatic" environmental impacts, beyond levels already anticipated and addressed in CEQA documentation prepared for the original Project Area No. 1 and Great Mall Project Area redevelopment plans. See page 2 of the attached Notice of Preparation for a listing of these previous CEQA documents.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The proposed merger-enabled sign construction and reconstruction activities would take place on vacant properties and/or available commercial sites (parking areas, etc.) near or adjacent to the I-880 and I-680 freeway rights-of-way. No existing or planned housing would be displaced by the proposed sign improvements.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See items XII.a and XII.b above.

## XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

*new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

- a) *Fire protection?* ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Explanation: The proposed redevelopment plan merger amendments and merger-enabled sign construction and reconstruction would not be expected to induce substantial additional urban growth in the Merged Project Area, and associated cumulative, "programmatic" environmental impacts, beyond levels already anticipated and addressed in CEQA documentation prepared for the original Project Area No. 1 and Great Mall Project Area redevelopment plans. See page 2 of the attached Notice of Preparation for a listing of these previous CEQA documents. The proposed merger-enabled new and reconstructed highway signs would not result in any significant new or physically altered fire protection, emergency medical, police, schools, parks, or other public facilities needs, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts.

- b) *Police protection?* ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

- c) *Schools?* ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

- d) *Parks?* ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

- e) *Other public facilities?* ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

#### XIV. RECREATION.

- a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?* ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

- b) *Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?* ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Explanation: See item XII.a above.

#### XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*

- a) *Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the* ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

Explanation: The proposed redevelopment plan merger amendments and merger-enabled sign construction and reconstruction would not be expected to induce substantial additional urban growth in the Merged Project Area, and associated cumulative, "programmatic" environmental impacts, beyond levels already anticipated and addressed in CEQA documentation prepared for the original Project Area No. 1 and Great Mall Project Area redevelopment plans. See page 2 of the attached Notice of Preparation for a list of these previous CEQA documents. In particular, the proposed additional redevelopment activities enabled by the merger would not be expected to result in a substantial increase in redevelopment project area vehicular trip generation, roadway volume-to-capacity ratios, or intersection congestion (level-of-service impacts) beyond those already anticipated and addressed in previous redevelopment program CEQA documentation.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item XV.a above.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See items XI.e and XI.f above.

- |  |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: The proposed new, visually prominent advertising signs, including the digital message board components, may have driver distraction and associated traffic safety impacts. The SEIR will address this issue.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The proposed new and reconstructed highway signs would have no significant effects on existing or planned emergency access provisions.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: Although one or more of the merger-enabled new advertising signs may be located within an existing private parking area, the number of displaced parking stalls would be minimal (5 or less). The proposed new and reconstructed highway signs would not be expected to have a significant site-specific or cumulative effect on parking adequacy.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: The merger-enabled additional redevelopment activities, including the proposed new and reconstructed advertising signs, would have no significant adverse impact on plans or programs supporting alternative transportation modes.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** *Would the project:*

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

- |   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less-Than-<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less-Than-<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact                        |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) <i>Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/>             | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) <i>Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) <i>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) <i>Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) <i>Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) <i>Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Explanation: See item XIII.a above.

#### XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- |  |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) <i>Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Explanation: This Initial Study has determined that impacts pertaining to the quality of the environment, (aesthetics, noise, and traffic safety) could be significant.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) <i>Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

Explanation: The proposed redevelopment plan merger amendments and merger-enabled advertising sign construction and reconstruction would not be expected to induce substantial additional urban growth in the Merged Project Area, and associated cumulative, "programmatic" environmental impacts, beyond levels already anticipated and addressed in CEQA documentation prepared for the original Project Area No. 1 and Great Mall Project Area redevelopment plans. See page 2 of the attached Notice of Preparation for a listing of these previous CEQA documents. The proposed merger-enabled additional redevelopment activities, including the proposed new and improved advertising signs, would have no significant additional cumulative environmental impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?



Explanation: See item XVII.a above.